Dickens in the Late-Victorian Context: Socio-Cultural, Politico-Economical, and Literary History in Bleak House, Great Expectations and 〒Sikes and Nancy〒

なか　むら　　たかし
中　村　　隆

学位の種類	博　士(文　学)
学位記番号	文博第　241　号
学位授与年月日	平成19年3月27日
学位授与の要件	学位規則第4条第1項該当
研究科・専攻	東北大学大学院文学研究科(博士課程後期3年の課程) 文化科学専攻
学位論文題目	Dickens in the Late-Victorian Context: Socio-Cultural, Politico-Economical, and Literary History in ***Bleak House***, ***Great Expectations*** and "Sikes and Nancy" (ディケンズと後期ヴィクトリア朝:『荒涼館』、『大いなる遺産』、「サイクスとナンシー」の社会文化史・政治経済史・英文学史)
論文審査委員	(主査) 教授　原　　英一　　教授　齊藤征雄 助教授　岩田美喜

論文内容の要旨

This study attempts to clarify the interrelationship between Dickens's novels and their politico-economical and socio-cultural contexts, with a view to investigating the author's varied interests at the time of the work in progress. Furthermore, a second purpose of this thesis is to reconsider Dickens and his works in terms of their relation to the so-called Great Tradition. F. R. Leavis, who once said "Dickens was in the fullest sense a great national artist" (Leavis 29-30), noted the powerful influence of Hogarth, among others, on Dickens, and dismissed Smollett and Fielding as relatively minor English masters. Similarly, Ronald Paulson notes the Hogarthian method of representation in Dickensian novels. Paulson has eloquently argued that Dickens's text is an "emblem" which "must be puzzled out and filled in" by the reader (Paulson, "Hogarth to Cruikshank" 49, 58-60). Indeed, Hogarth is omnipresent in Dickens, as this study testifies. When discussing "monetary realism" in *Great Expectations*, this study also examines Hogarth's influence on Dickens, reading Dickens's novel in relation to Hogarth's *Marriage A-la-mode*.

Concerning the socio-economical and cultural surroundings to Dickens's novels, the key issues discussed in Chapter I are Chadwick's ideas of saniatation, Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon, and bourgeois egotism. While in Chapter II, such long-standing literary and cultural motifs as the ghost, *memento mori* and *danse macabre* are connected with a discussion of Victorian capitalism, exploring Pip's role not only as a dreamer of visions but also

a disclaimer of capitalist ideas. Pip is annoyed by his double personality as, on one hand, seer of ghosts in a fairy-tale romance and, on the other hand, the protagonist of a realist novel who must abide by the rules of capitalism. Chapter III's argument is largely engaged with the socio-cultural context to Dickens's work. The third chapter discusses the writer's public readings and the gender question at the time of Dickens's closing years. The largely-female audience at Dickens's readings, who are characterized by vulnerable "hysteria," is discussed in this chapter against the backdrop of Victorian angelology, an issue which has been raised by Nina Auerbach and Elaine Showalter, to name but two. At the same time, Chapter III re-examines Dickens's readings in relation to English literary history. The point in question is the sensation novel of 1860s. This chapter argues that the heroine of the sensational mode helps to shape Dickens's portrayal of the viraginous Nancy. So far, having outlined the contents of each of the chapters of this thesis, I will now discuss the argument of each chapter in more detail.

What is in question in Chapter I are two different modes of art: one is the novel *Bleak House* and the other is the painting *Work*. The construction of the waterworks that formed the background of Ford Madox Brown's *Work* was a sketch Brown made in Hampstead on a "hot July sunlight" in 1852. In the same year, the serialization of *Bleak House* commenced, as "a fable for 1852" (Butt & Tillotson 179). Both of them engage directly with the "Sanitary Idea," which was "a leading idea of the age (Briggs, *Improvement* 335). Arguably, the curious coincidence of the novel's and the painting's genesis was brought about by their relationship to the Chadwickian public health movement at mid-century. It is worth noting that Chadwick was a devoted disciple of Bentham; and Bentham's Panopticon − with its central tower capable of seeing the inmates of a prison without being seen by them − came to symbolize an idealized power system in which the "gaze" over the prison's inmates was transparent, constant and total. It can be argued that the panoptic "gaze" is detected functioning in *Bleak House*, and that this gaze is, above all, directed towards Jo, the crossing-sweeper. Like the inmates of the Panopticon, Jo is kept "under constant surveillance" − in Jo's case, by Inspector Bucket.

Jo is "foregrounded," so to speak, by his fearful disease, smallpox. It should be noted in this place that the term "foregrounded" or "foregrounding" is basically used according to the poetics of the Prague school − if something is treated intentionally so as to be highlighted against the background, the act of "foregrounding" is accomplished (Lodge 2-3). Although the foregrounded disease is not specified as "smallpox" in *Bleak House*, the disease is almost certainly smallpox, for three reasons. First, smallpox causes fever, the symptom shown by Jo, Charley and Esther. Secondly, the temporal blindness suffered by Esther (ch. 31) can also be produced in smallpox cases. Lastly, and more importantly, smallpox is notorious for disfiguring its victims' faces, in precisely the ways that affect Charley and Esther. Thus, Jo − an innocent boy orphan − is an evil spirit in that he infects Charley with his smallpox, which in turn ravages Esther's face.

In the novel, it is the power of the "Detective Police" rather than Chancery that is expected to maintain constant vigilance over the poor (D. A. Miller 79). In the Victorian period, the aristocracy and bourgeoisie feared that the poor, whose main areas of residence were unhealthy slums like Tom-all-Alones, would spread epidemics including smallpox, cholera, typhus and scarlet fever, "through every order of society" (ch. 46).

It is curious that the novel's frightful message that "Tom has his revenge" (ch. 46) is echoed in Brown's painting. As in the novel, the first step in the painting is to "foreground" the poor in order to emphasize their dangerous or evil existence. In the painting, Jo's counterparts are four children, all of them miserable orphans, as the painter himself explains. These four "exceedingly ragged, dirty children" (Brown 153) are placed at the very front of the painting (see figure 1) as if to foreground their potential danger to the wealthy. In this relation, it is

noteworthy that Brown's tone of compassion for these four nameless orphans sounds particularly high-pitched when he alludes to the eldest daughter: "The eldest girl, not more than ten, poor child! is very worn-looking and thin. . ." (Brown 153). In sum, Brown's picture and Dickens's novel share a relationship to the contemporary concern with sanitation. Moreover, the piteous, but insanitary and dangerous, children in both works are overtly represented in the foreground in order to draw the viewer's or the reader's attention to these "dirty" orphans.

As noted above, in the depiction of Jo we can identify traces of bourgeois egotism or egocentricity. Similarly, this kind of bourgeois egocentricity can be detected in Brown's *Work*, which, whether consciously or not, explicitly proclaims the potential insanitary danger inherent in the four dirty orphans. The equation of the poor with the "dangerous classes" was a bourgeois ideology. This cold-blooded egotism is operating behind the pitiful scene of Charley taking care of her siblings, and Jo's death-bed scene - and similarly, in Brown's portrayal of the anonymous miserable orphans in the oil painting. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that Dickens with his tremendous verbal power to incite the reader's compassion not only succeeded in attracting a sanitarian attention toward the poor, but also rendered as moving as possible such heart-breaking scenes as the one in which Jo whispers his first but last prayers, or, the scene in which Esther "saw two silent tears fall down" upon the face of Charley (ch. 15, 193). At these moments, the reader of the day would have felt a responsibility to do something that was over and above egotism. It is, therefore, too simplistic to condemn Dickens as egocentric bourgeois proponents of the Chadwickian Sanitary Idea. Likewise, in the case of Brown, despite the slum-phobia disclosed in his painting, the painter was obviously critical of bourgeois egocentricity. As Brown's accompanied sonnet and pamphlet explaining the significance of the painting show, the rich who never work for "bread of life" are as evil as "noisome beggars," meanwhile the excavating "navvy" is placed at the center of the painting so that the "hero" in Work would represent the Puritan work ethic (Brown 152-53). Brown's indictment is leveled against the well-to-do; for instance, one can detect a sharp critique of the rich in the father-and-daughter pair on horseback at the apex of the painting (figure 1). The couple of father and daughter are significantly depicted as being barred by a fence from the site of construction in which the work (the title of the painting) is enacted. This signifies that father and daughter belonging to the aristocracy are excluded from or repelled by the central scene where the labouring class ideology sways.

By the same token, Dickens did not belong to the camp of the wealthy who were totally indifferent to the sufferings of the poor. In fact, Dickens was not a follower of Chadwick but a humanitarian novelist whose sense of social injustice was always keen, and whose indignation against social evils was always enormous. For this reason, Jo, the miserable orphan doomed to death by smallpox is, as a contemporary critic put it, "the gem of the book."

In Chapter II, I discuss the contrasting modes of novelistic "realism" and fairy-tale "romance" in *Great Expectations*. This contradictory relationship between two different literary modes is epitomized by the binary opposition between "ghosts" and "money." As for the so-called "realism" of the novel, Ian Watt has observed that reading English realist novels, which can be traced back to Richardson and Defoe, is "like reading evidence in a court of Justice" (Watt 35-37). Novels are in general characterized by their preference for specified time and place. In addition, it is evident that the majority of novels are deeply concerned with "money," and that money is often presented by arithmetical, statistical numbers. For Pip, money, as represented by rigid numbers, is one of the most crucial factors that determine his destiny.

On the other hand, one might argue that *Great Expectations* is a ghost story. In the famous opening scene of the novel, in which Pip is in deep reverie at the serene churchyard, he is suddenly aroused by a ghost-figure

– Magwitch the convict – who "*started up from among the graves* at the side of the church porch" ferociously roaring "Hold your noise!" (ch. 1. 4, my italics) as if to suggest the *danse macabre* motif. A little later Pip feels as though Magwitch were a "pirate come to life" (ch.1, 7). Even at the very beginning of the novel, Pip is presented to the reader as an idiosyncratic, fanciful child obsessed with ghosts. Pip's eyes, visualizing what ordinary eyes could not see, often catch glimpses of Miss Havisham's ghost. On the day when Pip is first invited to Satis House, he comes across the ghost of Miss Havisham in a nightmarish "day-dream." The haunting takes place in the decayed brewery which her ghost frequents from then onwards:

> . . . I saw a *figure hanging there by the neck*. . . the face was Miss Havisham's, with a movement going over the whole countenance as if she were trying to call to me. . . . (ch. 8, 64, my italics)

This female ghost is all the more dreadful since it looks like a hanged convict at Newgate Prison. And yet, Pip paradoxically feels both repulsion and attraction toward the ghost. He confesses: "I at first ran from it, and then ran towards it" (ch. 8, 64). Pip both loves and loathes this vision, because he is half a "dreamer" who fancies himself living in a fairy tale world, while the other half of him is a Victorian realist, who is not allowed to believe in ghosts.

The ghost in *Great Expectations* is a product of the conventional fairy-tale dreamworld. Furthermore, the fanciful Pip is fond of telling childish "lies" that are quite illogical and have no meaning at all. Pip likes to invent fanciful cock-and-bull stories. For instance, when asked about Miss Havisham and Satis House, he talks of "a black velvet coach" and immensely large "four dogs" in Miss Havisham's room (ch. 9, 68); in his mind, Pip fabricates a story about a "balloon in the yard" and "a bear in the brewery" (ch. 9, 69). Later in the novel, however, Pip, by virtue of his brilliant power of fancy, ironically invents a totally different kind of fiction: one about money.

Money is a recurrent motif of the English novel in the eighteen and nineteenth centuries. To name a few example, in *Clarissa*, Lovelace offers to the titular heroine "£2000 *per annum*" to marry him (Letter 186, 596-97), or, in *Northanger Abbey*, Eleanor's marriage with a "man of fortune and consequence" makes her father (General Tilney) so relieved that he consents to his son's marriage with Catherine, who eventually turns out to have "three thousand pounds" (ch. 30, 247). References to money are thus central to these novels particularly in relation to marriage. In Dickens, however, the circumstances attending money are a little different, for money in Dickensian novels is dealt with in the light of purely capitalistic aspects, rather than from matrimonial viewpoints.

The figure of Wemmick in *Great Expectations* is a good example of this. There is a valedictory scene in the novel in which Wemmick gives a parting salutation to "Colonel" the prisoner, who is destined to be executed the following day. In this sentimental moment, what may be termed as "monetary realism" is abruptly invoked by Wemmick; he promises to take care of Colonel's "remarkable breed of *tumblers*" (ch. 32, 262, my italics), perhaps for the sake of their considerable value. After the interview with "Colonel," the sagacious Wemmick advises Pip: "Still you see, as far as it goes, a pair of pigeons are *portable property*, all the same" (ch. 32, 262, my italics). It is worth remembering here that Wemmick has a double personality. Wemmick's tenderness, known as "Walworth sentiments," (ch. 36, 291) is only revealed at home, whereas away from home in the City Wemmick becomes an unsympathetic, matter-of-fact person. In visiting the prison, the Janus-faced Wemmick comes to see pigeons – tumblers – as "portable property." It is of note that "tumblers" are specifically developed, precious birds which "fanciers" valued highly in the mid-Victorian period. On account of this, one might say that the "tumblers" which Wemmick desires to possess are a "commodity" that can be transformed into "monetary form." In this way, Wemmick commits himself to the capitalist system. What matters most in this system is money, wealth, capital and

"portable property."

Let us turn now to another shallow capitalist: Pumblechook, who asks Pip about accounting: "*Now!* How much is forty-three pence?" (ch. 9, 67). Although he knows the right answer, Pip persists in saying, "I don't know" because, I would suggest, his fanciful mind resists the harsh capitalist reality. Arithmetical numbers (e.g. forty-three) betoken hard reality. Pip is, as it were, an anti-capitalist, but his tragedy is that he is encircled by hard capitalists like Pumblechook and Wemmick (when away from his home). Besides, for Pip, Magwitch is the most terrifying capitalist, who is gifted with business talent. Succeeding in sheep-farming and other trades in the new world, he boasts: "I've done wonderful well. There's others went out alonger me as has done well too, but no man has done nigh as well as me" (ch. 39, 317).

After a considerable absence from the novelistic stage, Magwitch (alias Provis) reappears before the hero, bringing with him two small, enigmatic signs: "Five" and "J." First of all, Magwitch refers to the letter "Five," which means Pip's annual income: five hundred pounds. The next enigma is "J," that is, J of Jaggers the lawyer. All of a sudden, Pip (to his painful disillusionment) recognizes Magwitch, the convict, as his real benefactor. One could say therefore that these small signs – "Five" and "J" – help shape the machinery that sets the novel's "monetary realism" in motion.

Numbers as signs contrast sharply with the novel's fairy-tale elements. To escape from the harsh reality of the capitalist society, Pip, the seer of visions, turns himself into another Micawber: a perpetual debtor with a belief or "fiction" that "something" will "turn up" to save him. Pip is himself willing to indulge in such Micawber-like fictions. On one occasion, Pip asks Herbert to "estimate" his debt in "round numbers" (ch. 34, 276) because Pip knows that estimation can distort and soften monetary reality. Pip thus undermines the mathematical rigidity inherent in capitalism, and in fact, by his pecuniary manipulation, money is rendered (temporarily) unstable and wavering. But, despite this strategy to avoid the harshness of monetary economy by turning specific numbers into "round numbers," Pip becomes stuck in heavy debt and nearly goes bankrupt.

To Pip's further misfortune, he has to confront yet another capitalist in the epilogue of the novel. In the closing scene, Estella's words sound somewhat like a "landed gentleman": "The ground belongs to me. It is the only possession I have not relinquished" (ch. 59, 483). Pip then asks her: "Is it [Satis House] to be built on?" (ch. 59, 483). Her answer is: "At last it is. I came here to take leave of it before its change. . ." (ch. 59, 483). Estella is now standing on her own ground, probably to start afresh as a Victorian entrepreneur who is going to inherit Miss Havisham's family brewing business. On this last occasion, Estella rather abruptly reveals herself not merely as a *femme fatale* – one who has been exercising her charms on Pip in a conventional fairy-tale dreamworld – but also a hard capitalist, like Pumblechook or Wemmick. Estella is a capitalist heroine; while on the other, Pip steadfastly remains a dreamer, disclaiming capital or "great expectations." Because of his inability to abide by the rules of capitalist society, Pip is in the end estranged from everything and everybody he either loves or dislikes.

My third chapter focuses upon "Sikes and Nancy," in the context of the sensation novel of the 1860s, and specifically in the light of the representation of women around and after the mid-century. This chapter deals with Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* (1859-60), Mrs. Henry Wood's *East Lynne* (1860-61), and Mary Braddon's *Lady Audley's Secret* (1861-62) – particularly in their relation to Dickens's "Sikes" narrative. It is evident that Nancy, Laura Fairlie, Lady Isabel, and Lady Audley have something in common: all of them are presented before the reader as the possessor of men's crucial secrets, to the extent that these female protagonists' existences can be both dangerous and fatal to men. Lady Audley is, for example, dangerous to men of rank and fashion on account

of her anti-social position as a bigamist and murderess. In a similar way, Lady Isabel, who is an errant wife as well as a fallen woman, threatens a potential danger to a traditional, patriarchal town community, West Lynne.

In this connection, it should be noted that in the wake of the unprecedented vogue for sensation fiction that "Sikes" episode was read and presented by Dickens. The heroines of the sensational mode were a direct precursor to the Nancy of Dickens's late readings. In his public readings from 1869 through 1870, Nancy was "foregrounded" as a paradoxical figure: both angel and demon, like the heroines of the novels of the 1860s. Put another way, the heroines of these novels and Nancy are twin-sisters by dint of the attraction, and conversely repulsion, that they exercise over their husbands.

In the public reading, Dickens, as actor/performer of his own novels, is spotlighted as a gifted "mesmerist," as an 1870 watercolor drawing of one of his readings (figure 2) suggests. Dickens the mesmerist magnetized his female − not male − audience:

> At Clifton on Monday night we had a contagion of *fainting*. . . . we had from *a dozen to twenty ladies* taken out *stiff* and *rigid*, at various times! (Forster II: 359, my italics)

This somewhat sexual interrelation between the male mesmerist and the women's "fainting" directs our attention to Charcot and Freud, both of whom unveiled hitherto hidden dimensions of "hysteria" in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Hysteria was a condition which induced in its victims a variety of paralyses despite the lack of discoverable physiological causes (Porter, *Benefit* 514). It was Charcot's work that led Freud to explore the etiology of hysteria, which resulted in Freud's seminal *Studies on Hysteria* (1895). Charcot was convinced that "mesmerism" could produce such hysterical responses as trance or delirium. In spite of this, what is striking about Charcot's demonstration is that such extravagant performances at the Sâlpetrière Hospital depended upon the cooperation of women. As Roy Porter puts it, the hysterical behaviors of Charcot's "star" hysterical performers were not objective phenomena but "artefacts" within the theatrical atmosphere of the Sâlpetrière (*Benefit* 514). This quasi-sexual relationship between male doctor and female patient is similar to that of the mesmerist-reader (Dickens) and the female audience, with three problematical issues − Nancy, hysteria and the female audience − coming to the fore.

Some of the female audience facing the lurid scene of the murder of Nancy did faint, as Charcot's women patients became hysterical in the highly-theatrical atmosphere of the Sâlpetrière (figure 3). In Dickens's public readings, it is probable that such fainting had its own theatrical, performative, aspects. However, it is worth pointing out that in the later Victorian period, hysteria came to have other significances for women. When a woman fell into hysteria, whether she was a "daughter," "wife" or "mother," she was granted the right to be nursed, and to be excused from feminine duties (Showalter, *Feminine Malady* 133). In this sense, hysteria afforded women an excuse for extricating themselves from domestic chores. I argue, therefore, that to faint or become magnetized at the public reading was an expression of a woman's latent desire to be set free; such desire was an implicit protest against the "general opinion of the day that natural vocation of a woman is that of a wife and mother" (Mill 144). Poor Nancy, who is murdered by her violent husband-figure Sikes, is an incarnation of the Victorian self-sacrificial ideal that J. S. Mill criticized. If Sikes is representative of the Victorian tyrant husband, the rendering of Nancy is as a submissive wife whose "Christianity" is revealed by her self-sacrificial death. But still, ironically, even after her death completes her depiction as a Christian daughter and Christian wife, Nancy turns herself into demon-like *femme fatale* in the shape of a fearsome ghost.

In this sense, Nancy is similar to Miss Havisham, whose existence itself is an expression of anger and revenge

upon the unfaithful husband-figure. At any rate, Nancy is another Victorian Medusa − transfixing and terrifying − in the footsteps of the heroines of the sensation novel. It should be noted, however, that Dickens's "feminist" claims are not overt but covert as the avenger's (Nancy) agency in the death of her killer (Sikes) is made minimal. She is no longer Nancy herself but a ghost − and a mere pair of ghostly "eyes."

Obviously Dickens was dubious about marriage as a social institution, partly because he himself had become bitterly disillusioned with his wife, Catherine. As Pamela Johnson notes, in Dickens's novels marriage operates as "punishment" rather than blessing (Johnson 175). The similarity between Nancy and the heroines of the sensation novel can also be found in their shared disbelief in marriage as a social contract. Lady Audley, Lady Isabel, and Nancy are allied sisters who swear vengeance against the sacred institution of matrimony. Miss Havisham, the predecessor of these heroines, expresses her deep-seated hatred of an untrustworthy husband (Compeyson) and of men in general. But in the characterization of strong-minded Nancy, we notice an explicit claim that matrimony is no longer sacred nor blissful.

論文審査結果の要旨

本論文は、ディケンズ Charles Dickens の後期小説の執筆時期における作者の多様な関心を、社会文化史・政治経済史の枠組みにおいて解明するとともに、作家とその作品の英文学史における位置づけを再検討することを試みたものである。

第Ⅰ章は、ディケンズの小説『荒涼館』*Bleak House* とブラウン Ford Madox Brown の油彩画『労働』Work に共通する19世紀中葉の公衆衛生問題の意味を解明している。根底に功利主義を持つ公衆衛生思想は、ベンサム Jeremy Bentham が考案した監獄パノプティコン Panopticon におけるような透徹した「眼差し」を貧民に注ぐ。小説と油彩画でともに前景化される孤児たちは、公衆衛生の眼差しの下で監視されているが、同時に、彼らは、その不潔な肉体によって、貧困、不衛生、伝染病というスラムのあらゆる悪弊を告発する主体でもある。危険な孤児たちは、公衆衛生思想の標的になると同時に、貧困に無関心なヴィクトリア朝の同時代人を告発していたのである。小説家ディケンズにおいては、子供の涙を契機として、また、画家ブラウンにおいては、巧みな光の構図の処理を通して、スラムの孤児たちが、犠牲者でありながら、同時にまた、半ば英雄でもあることが示されている。

第Ⅱ章では、小説『大いなる遺産』*Great Expectations* に内在する「リアリズム」と「おとぎ話」という、相反する2つの要素の意義が解明される。リアリズムを端的に表すものとして「金銭」があり、他方、空想的おとぎ話を象徴するものとして「幽霊」がある。主人公のピップ Pip は、普通の人間には見えないものが見えてしまう空想に支配されているために、頻繁に幽霊を見る。その一方で、主人公の空想力は「金銭」をめぐる「虚構」をも生み出す。ピップが捏造した金銭をめぐるフィクションは、貨幣経済の根底にある厳密な数字を意図的に歪曲することで、自らの借金をごまかす企てであった。しかし、主人公は、資本主義経済の規範を逸脱するために、破産に追い込まれる。主人公にとっての最大の不幸は、彼を取り巻く者たちが、どんな小さなものにも貨幣価値を見出し、それらを「商品」とみなすヴィクトリア朝的資本主義思想の体現者であったことである。

第Ⅲ章は、ディケンズの晩年に焦点をあて、彼の公開朗読とジェンダーをめぐる問題に取り組んだものである。ディケンズの公開朗読での女性観客は、ヒステリーに罹りやすいという特質があると、作家自身によって強調されるが、ショウォルター Elaine Showalter によって提起された女性とヒステリーと

いう問題が、この章では検証されている。

第Ⅲ章はまた、ディケンズの公開朗読を、英文学史の枠組みの中で再検討している。具体的には、初期の小説『オリヴァー・トウィスト』*Oliver Twist* から採られた公開朗読の一演目「サイクスとナンシー」"Sikes and Nancy" と、1860年代に隆盛を極めた「扇情小説」sensation novel を比較し、相互の類似点として、「魔性のヒロイン」femme fatale 像が指摘される。これらの魔性の女たちは、家庭が聖なる空間であり、結婚が聖なる制度であり、女性が聖なる存在であるというヴィクトリア朝の神話を根本から否定する存在であることが立証されている。

ディケンズの後期創作活動の原動力であった社会・文化・政治・経済の状況を綿密なリサーチによって解明し、作品解釈の新たな基盤を提供した本論文は、我が国のディケンズおよびヴィクトリア朝文学研究に貢献するところがきわめて大きい。

よって、本論文の提出者は、博士（文学）の学位を授与されるに十分な資格を有するものと認められる。